Towards a national working group on cross-border issues

Working group on innovative solutions to cross-border obstacles
1st step: Analyzing the French contributions to the EU public consultation

- **Methodology:**
  - only the contributions from the ground were analyzed (not the contributions from national stakeholders)
  - 30 replies containing in average three kinds of obstacles -> 94 obstacles

- **Main findings:**
  - All the borders are not equally represented (IT and outermost regions: 1 contribution each)
  - Contributions are more based on the perception than on documented situations
  - Ranking is slightly different from the one at European level:
    - 1. Accessibility obstacles
    - 2. Legal and administrative obstacles
    - 3. Cultural obstacles
    - 4. Conjectural/Situational obstacles
Overview of the obstacles at French borders

- Accessibilité: 28%
- Information Communication: 17%
- Obstacles conjoncturels: 8%
- Obstacles culturels: 22%
- Obstacles légaux et administratifs: 25%
1. Accessibility

**Congested infrastructures at FR-LU border**
- Accessibilité: 46%
- Information Communication: 15%
- Obstacles conjoncturels: 8%
- Obstacles culturels: 16%
- Obstacles légaux et administratifs: 15%

**Lacking infrastructures at FR-BE border**
- Accessibilité: 36%
- Information Communication: 29%
- Obstacles conjoncturels: 21%
- Obstacles culturels: 14%
- Obstacles légaux et administratifs: 7%

**Transports too costly at FR-UK border**
- Accessibilité: 21%
- Information Communication: 29%
- Obstacles conjoncturels: 14%
- Obstacles culturels: 7%
- Obstacles légaux et administratifs: 15%
2. Legal and administrative obstacles: especially by cooperating with third countries

Many legal and administrative obstacles and loss of trust at FR-CH border

In French Guyana, crossing the border could be difficult
3. Cultural obstacles

Lacking language skills at FR-DE border

- Accessibilité: 24%
- Information Communication: 23%
- Obstacles conjoncturels: 24%
- Obstacles culturels: 31%
- Obstacles légaux et administratifs: 15%

Trust building at FR-SP border

- Accessibilité: 31%
- Information Communication: 15%
- Obstacles conjoncturels: 8%
- Obstacles culturels: 46%
- Obstacles légaux et administratifs: 31%
2nd step: Testing the matrix with case studies

- **Methodology:**
  - Contributions from the ground were not documented enough to test the matrix
  - Four case studies from the European CB review

- **Main findings:**
  - 4 items were added:
    - Available documentation on the obstacle
    - Public concerned
    - Impact on the ground
    - Organizations already working on the policy field concerned
  - Perception and reality can be very different:
    - Questioning the political proactivity and willingness to cooperate: communication and visibility of actions undertaken?
    - View from the ground / from the experts
Proposition : a comprehensive matrix consistent with existing initiatives

1. Border concerned.
2. Localization.
3. Specificities of the territory: Urban / rural / mountainous / littoral…
4. Policy field: healthcare / education / employment…
5. Nature of the obstacle: legal / cultural / administrative…
7. Level of resolution: local / regional / national / international.
9. Structured framework of cooperation: structured governance / intergovernmental agreement.
10. Experience that could inspire authorities.
11. Existing tool or mechanism that could apply in the situation.
12. For legal, regulatory, or technical obstacle: added value and feasibility of the ECBC (European cross-border convention)?
13. ETC Programs on the geographical zone?
14. Project(s) already financed on this thematic?
15. Thematic covered by the ETC programs of the zone?
Conclusions

- Establishing a multilevel governance: experts, ministries, and local authorities based on a long-term process and permanent tools.
- Improving the communication around projects and cooperation actions.
- Deepening the analysis of ETC programs (strategies and projects) and the border needs.
A systematic approach to tackle cross border impediments

- Completing and validating the first analysis made
- Identifying the French competent authorities
- Identifying potential ESI funds contribution to solve the problem
- Identifying good practices that could be reused
- Analyzing the adequacy of existing tools and the feasibility of the ECBC
Thank you for your attention

melanie.charotte@cget.gouv.fr